



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/611,690	06/30/2003	Christopher Budd	13768.385	8387
47973 7590 04/20/2009 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
			EXAMINER	
			FISHER, PAUL R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/20/2009 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/611,690

**Applicant(s)**

BUDD ET AL.

**Examiner**

PAUL R. FISHER

**Art Unit**

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 13-18, 20-31, 34-49, 51-61 and 64-72 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 13-18, 20-31, 34-49, 51-61 and 64-72 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Amendment received on January 20, 2009 has been acknowledged. Claims 6-7, 9-11, 19, 32-33, 50, 62 and 63 have been cancelled. Claims 64-72 have been added. Claims 1-5, 8, 13-18, 20-31, 34-49, 51-61, and 64-72 are currently pending and have been considered below.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 3, 8, 14, 29, 34-38, 40, 53-54 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claims 3, 29 and 53, it is unclear to the Examiner if this is a new representative from a new team or merely a representative from one of the existing teams and how this is different from the independent claim where the second team is notified of the completion of the first or previous step. Also this new third interface is it corresponding to a new team or is part of the interface of one of the existing teams?

In claims 8, 34, and 54, it is unclear to the Examiner if this is a new representative from a new team or merely a representative from one of the existing teams and how this is different from the independent claim where the second team is notified of the completion of the first or previous step. Also this new third interface is it corresponding to a new team or is part of the interface of one of the existing teams? In claims 9-12 and 35-38, it is unclear to the Examiner how the previous step can

correspond to any team but the first team since in the independent claim it is claimed as such, at which point how do these claims further limit the invention?

Claims 35-38 depend from claim 34, and are therefore rejection on the same rationale.

In claim 14, 40 and 56, it is unclear to the Examiner how some, but not all of any team can be notified since the independent claim states that teams can comprise one person? How is it possible to notify some of one person but not all of one person?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-5, 8, 13-18, 26-31, 34-49, 51-61, and 64-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bugzilla: <http://web.archive.org/web/20020202141951/bugzilla.org/about.html> (Feb. 2, 2002) hereafter Bugzilla.**

**As per claims 1, 22, 26, 48, 60 and 61,** Bugzilla discloses a server computing system network connectable to a plurality of client computing systems, a method and program for the server computing system coordinating communication between the plurality of client computing systems in a manner that assists in inter-team cooperation for accomplishing a collaborative goal (Page 1, paragraph 1; discloses that Bugzilla is

an example of a class of computer programs called "Defect Tracking Systems", or more commonly "Bug-Tracking Systems". Defect Tracking Systems allow individual or groups of developers to keep track of outstanding bugs in their product effectively, thus this system works over a network to assist groups or teams of developers in accomplishing their goal of fixing software bugs in their products).

an act of the server computing system analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, or advances development of corrective software for a software performance deviation in a product or a system bug, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of clients computing systems (While Bugzilla doesn't explicitly disclose the system server analyzing the collaborative goal it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of computer software corrections that the server would have to analyze the information it was given to know who be responsible to carry out the corrections. Pages 33-41; disclose the Administrations job from a top down approach the Product or computer program is broken down into components which are could all have possible bugs, these bugs would have to be identified, then each step could correspond to fixing a particular bug in a particular component of the over all computer product, so in this example say there were software problems in your "UI", "API", "Sound System" components then the steps would be to correct bugs in the various components and each group or team would be assigned a particular component as disclosed on Page 34, paragraphs 1 and 2

specifically. It could also be that there were multiple bugs in a single component and there are multiple teams that work in that individual component. Pages 15-16; discloses that through the Query page the server system can analyze what steps are assigned to correcting a current bug and who is assigned to those steps it can also tell the current status of each step and substep to determine what stage the over all project is at).

**(Claim 60)** a step for facilitating communication between the plurality of client computing systems in a manner that facilitates completion of the course of steps (Pages 15-16; discloses that the system can notify the user what steps they are responsible for and what the status of each of the other steps are currently at to facilitate communication between the users of the system which helps achieve the completion of the course of steps).

an act of the server computing system determining that a first team of one or more users is responsible for proper implementation of the step, the course of steps including at least a first step for which the first team is determined to be responsible, and a second, subsequent step for which a second, different team is determined to be responsible, the second team including at least one member that is not a member of the first team (Page 34, paragraphs 1 and 2; disclose that each component or piece of the over all product can be divided into groups and the software fixes for bugs in those components could also be designed in the same groups, if the step were to correspond to fixing a particular bug in a particular component then it would be assigned to the group or team which is assigned to that component. Page 38; discloses that the administrator could also assign responsibility to each team for a product individually for

example if it was a security risk you could assign various parts of the project to different people which would all have to work on their individual parts in order to fix the security bug).

for the first step in the course of steps, an act of the server computing system presenting to at least a representative user of the first team a first dynamically generated, customized user interface, the first user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed (Pages 15-16; discloses that as part of the system an interface is presented to each user based on their user name and password so it is dynamically created for each individual user and each of the fields are updated as progress is made on each step);

an act of the server computing system automatically notifying at least a representative user of the second team the first step has been completed (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step); and

after the act of the server computing system automatically notifying at least the representative user of the second team, an act of the server computing system presenting to at least a representative user of the second team a second dynamically generated, customized user interface, the second user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the second, subsequent step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to an updated current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step. Pages 15-16; discloses that as part of the system an interface is presented to each user based on their user name and password so it is dynamically created for each individual user and each of the fields are updated as progress is made on each step).

Therefore in view of the teachings of Bugzilla it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the system of Bugzilla is implemented on a server and that it is the server that analyzes information regarding software bugs and then distributes the responsibility for the correction of those issues to



users or teams assigned to those tasks. Bugzilla further shows that the users have interfaces presented to them and updated by the central server as to the status of the various steps being tracked. This way when one step is finished the other users of the system will be aware and respond accordingly. Consequently, the Examiner asserts that the current claims are not patentably distinct from Bugzilla since as understood by the Examiner the current claim only discloses a server system which stores a list of tasks with a final goal, distributes those tasks to specific groups, tracks the groups progress of each task and notifies appropriate individuals of the tasks progress, which as discussed above is rendered obvious by Bugzilla.

**As per claims 2, 28, and 51,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses where the subsequent step in the course of steps comprises a plurality of substeps configured for processing in parallel (Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time).

**As per claims 3, 29, and 53,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of automatically notifying at least the representative of the second team that a first substep in the plurality of substeps has been completed (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change,

further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step); and

after the act of notifying at least the representative of the second team that the first substep is completed, an act of providing a third user interface to at least the representative of the team determined to be responsible for completing a second, subsequent substep in the plurality of substeps, the third user interface providing information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the second subsequent substep (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time).

**As per claims 4 and 30**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the first step in the course of steps comprises a plurality of substeps configured for processing in parallel (Page 25, bullet 6; discloses

that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time).

**As per claims 5, and 31**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the first team includes at least one member that is not a member of the second team (Page 38; discloses that the administrator could also assign responsibility to each team for a product individually for example if it was a security risk you could assign various parts of the project to different people which would all have to work on their individual parts in order to fix the security bug. It would have been obvious from this that when setting up the responsibility of each task the administrator could have assigned the different tasks to different users).

**As per claims 8, 34 and 54**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of automatically notifying at least the representative of the first team that a first substep in the plurality of substeps has been completed (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned

tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step); and

after the act of notifying at least the representative of the first team that the first substep is completed, an act of providing a third user interface to at least the representative of the team determined to be responsible for completing a second, subsequent substep in the plurality of substeps, the third user interface providing information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the second subsequent substep (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time).

**As per claims 13, 39 and 55,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of causing at least the representative of the second team to automatically receive an e-mail notification upon the completion of the first step (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular

team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step).

**As per claims 14, 40 and 56**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of determining that the second team comprises a plurality of members (Pages 38-41; disclose that groups can be set up which could include a plurality of members); and

an act of causing some, but not all, of the second team members to be automatically notified upon the completion of the first step (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step, if a user is not set up to receive the email they would be excluded from the notification, further it is unclear how as stated in the independent claims you could have a group of one person and some but not all of the users be notified, from this the Examiner is reading it that notifications can be sent based on the setup which is shown by Bugzilla).

**As per claims 15, 41, and 57,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of causing all of the second team to be automatically notified upon the completion of the first step (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step, if a user is not set up to receive the email they would be excluded from the notification, further it is unclear how as stated in the independent claims you could have a group of one person and some but not all of the users be notified, from this the Examiner is reading it that notifications can be sent based on the setup which is shown by Bugzilla).

**As per claims 16, and 42,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the first user interface may be accessed by all of the first team (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow

database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time. Pages 38-41; disclose that each user is allowed to view tasked based on which groups they belong to, from this it is shown if all users belonged the first team or first group they would all be allowed to view the corresponding interface).

**As per claims 17, and 43,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the second user interface may be accessed by all of the second team (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time. Pages 38-41; disclose that each user is allowed to view tasked based on which groups they belong to, from this it is shown if all users belonged the second team or second group they would all be allowed to view the corresponding interface).

**As per claims 18, and 44,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the second user interface may be accessed by all of the second team (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned

to. Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time. Pages 38-41; disclose that each user is allowed to view tasked based on which groups they belong to, from this it is shown if all users belonged the second team or second group they would all be allowed to view the corresponding interface).

**As per claims 20, 46, and 58,** Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act notifying at least the representative of the first team of a network address of at least the representative of the second team, wherein at least the representative of the second team is automatically notified directly by the first team upon the completion of the first step (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance standpoint the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step, if a user is not set up to receive the email they would be excluded from the notification, from this the Examiner is reading it that notifications can be sent based on the setup which is shown by Bugzilla.



The Examiner asserts that an email address is equivalent to a network address since both a used to contact a desired person).

**As per claims 21, 47 and 59**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of receiving notification from the first team that the first step is completed (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step, if a user is not set up to receive the email they would be excluded from the notification, further it is unclear how as stated in the independent claims you could have a group of one person and some but not all of the users be notified, from this the Examiner is reading it that notifications can be sent based on the setup which is shown by Bugzilla); and

an act of automatically notifying at least the representative of the second team in response to the act of receiving notification (Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the

second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step, if a user is not set up to receive the email they would be excluded from the notification, further it is unclear how as stated in the independent claims you could have a group of one person and some but not all of the users be notified, from this the Examiner is reading it that notifications can be sent based on the setup which is shown by Bugzilla).

**As per claims 23, 24, 25, and 49**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the physical media is both system memory and persistent memory (Page 24; discloses that this program is to be used on a computer system and needs to be downloaded and installed onto a computer which would be installed on a Hard Drive which is considered to be system memory and a persistent (non-volatile) memory).

**As per claims 27 and 52**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses an act of detecting a software performance deviation in the product (Page 18, writing a great bug report; disclose that the system can detect a software performance deviation or software bug).

**As per claim 35**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the team that corresponds to the second first step is the same as the first team (Page 38-41; discloses grouping of users based on tasks, from this it is shown that tasks assigned to the first group or team would correspond to that team and would not be viewable by any other team).

**As per claim 36**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the team that corresponds to the second step is at least

partially different than the first team (Page 38-41; discloses grouping of users based on tasks, from this it is shown that tasks assigned to the first group or team would correspond to that team and would not be viewable by any other team, further it is possible to have users who have access to multiple step and users who are restricted to a single task for example a user can be part of the first team and part of the second team and view both tasks, while another user could only have rights to the first task).

**As per claim 37**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the team that corresponds to the second step is the same as the second team (Page 38-41; discloses grouping of users based on tasks, from this it is shown that tasks assigned to the second group or team would correspond to that team and would not be viewable by any other team).

**As per claim 38**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the team that corresponds to the second step is at least partially different than the second team (Page 38-41; discloses grouping of users based on tasks, from this it is shown that tasks assigned to the second group or team would correspond to that team and would not be viewable by any other team, further it is possible to have users who have access to multiple step and users who are restricted to a single task for example a user can be part of the first team and part of the second team and view both tasks, while another user could only have rights to the first task).

**As per claim 45**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the product is a first product and the software performance deviation is in a plurality of products including the first product (Page 18, writing a great

bug report; disclose that the system can detect a software performance deviation or software bug, it would have been obvious that the software deviation could be found in not only the first product but a set of products as stated in Bugzilla it is known for a product or product line to have different versions or milestones it is possible to have a bug that is present in all of the various products).

**As per claim 64**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the process involved with resolving a detected software performance deviation comprises an investigation (Page 18, writing a great bug report; disclose that the system can detect a software performance deviation or software bug, it would have been obvious that an investigation has to be conducted in order to understand what has to be fixed, the Examiner asserts that a bug report is equivalent to an investigation).

**As per claim 65**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the investigation includes resolving detected software performance deviations in a plurality of software programs (Page 18, writing a great bug report; disclose that the system can detect a software performance deviation or software bug, it would have been obvious that the software deviation could be found in not only the first product but a set of products as stated in Bugzilla it is known for a product or product line to have different versions or milestones it is possible to have a bug that is present in all of the various products).

**As per claim 66**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein access privileges regulating who has access to one or more

investigations in a plurality of investigations are determined by the server computing system (Pages 38-41; discloses that groups can be set up to restrict access to who can work on or view particular investigations or bugs).

**As per claim 67**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the access privileges allow a user access to view or edit anything for any investigation (Pages 38-41; discloses that groups can be set up to restrict access to who can work on or view particular investigations or bugs).

**As per claim 68**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the access privileges allow a user access to view or edit anything for software performance deviations related to a particular software program (Pages 38-41; discloses that groups can be set up to restrict access to who can work on or view particular investigations or bugs).

**As per claim 69**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the access privileges allow a user access to view or edit anything for a specific software performance deviation (Pages 38-41; discloses that groups can be set up to restrict access to who can work on or view particular investigations or bugs).

**As per claim 70**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the first user interface is browser-based (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts

and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 1; discloses that the system has HTML support which means it is browser-based).

**As per claim 71**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein a web page comprising the first user interface is dynamically generated based on software application state information that results from processing at least one step in the course of steps (Page 14, Create a Bugzilla Account; discloses that each user creates their own portal into the system through the creation of an account, through this they will be able to receive email alerts and other information and the projects they are assigned to. Page 1; discloses that the system has HTML support which means it is browser-based).

**As per claim 72**, Bugzilla discloses the above-enclosed invention, Bugzilla further discloses wherein the email notification comprises an embedded hyperlink that links to a user interface that allows completion of a subsequent step (Page 20, line 13; discloses that the system utilizes hyper links, Page 1; discloses that the system has XML and HTML support and also has email functions. From this it would have been obvious that a hyperlink could be used to indicate the completion of a step).

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed September 24, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
7. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Bugzilla fails to teach or suggest a server computing system analyzing the collaborative goal to identify a course of steps wherein, as each step is successfully completed, the collaborative goal is advanced

from the goal's current state toward the goal's completed state, the course of steps requiring cooperation between at least two teams of one or more users of the plurality of client computing systems," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above in the 103 rejection, while Bugzilla doesn't explicitly disclose the system server analyzing the collaborative goal it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of computer software corrections that the server would have to analyze the information it was given to know who be responsible to carry out the corrections. Pages 33-41; disclose the Administrations job from a top down approach the Product or computer program is broken down into components which are could all have possible bugs, these bugs would have to be identified, then each step could correspond to fixing a particular bug in a particular component of the over all computer product, so in this example say there were software problems in your "UI", "API", "Sound System" components then the steps would be to correct bugs in the various components and each group or team would be assigned a particular component as disclosed on Page 34, paragraphs 1 and 2 specifically. It could also be that there were multiple bugs in a single component and there are multiple teams that work in that individual component. Pages 15-16; discloses that through the Query page the server system can analyze what steps are assigned to correcting a current bug and who is assigned to those steps it can also tell the current status of each step and substep to determine what stage the over all project is at. The Examiner asserts that limitations of the claims as currently written have been met.

8. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Bugzilla fails to teach or suggest a server computing system presenting to at least a representative user of the first team a

first dynamically generated, customized user interface, the first user interface providing customized information and interfaces that facilitate completion of the first step, the customized information and interfaces including a plurality of static and dynamic fields populated with information corresponding to the current state of the collaborative goal, wherein the dynamic fields are continually updated as other steps of the goal are completed," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated above in the 103 rejection, Pages 15-16; discloses that as part of the system an interface is presented to each user based on their user name and password so it is dynamically created for each individual user and each of the fields are updated as progress is made on each step. The Examiner asserts that limitations of the claims as currently written have been met.

9. In response to the applicant's argument that, "Bugzilla does not mention generating customized user interfaces, nor does it mention generating such interfaces in response to a determination of steps that are to be taken in the completion of a collaborative goal," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown above Bugzilla does provide each user with a custom interface which updates as different parts of a project are updated, which are steps toward completing the collaborative goal. Pages 15-16; discloses that as part of the system an interface is presented to each user based on their user name and password so it is dynamically created for each individual user and each of the fields are updated as progress is made on each step. Page 21, paragraph 3; discloses the user can set up their account so that every time the status on a particular bug is fixed they would be notified via email about the change, further it states that from a quality assurance stand point the could wait till a particular team finishes their work



and notify via email the quality assurance people to inspect their work, from this example it is shown that the first team completes their assigned tasks and then and only then the second team can complete their task of inspecting if that was the assigned step. As stated above these elements together create a customer user interface, customer to that user since only the elements they are assigned to will appear and only the projects they are interested will be tracked as far as status. As the various steps are completed the interface will be updated to show the new status and the user will be notified that a step has been completed. The Examiner asserts that limitations of the claims as currently written have been met.

10. In response to the applicant's argument that, "the prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the first step in the course of steps comprises a plurality of substeps configured for processing in parallel," the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in the above rejection Bugzilla discloses Page 25, bullet 6; discloses that the system can perform bug corrects either in parallel or in series, for example if two people are working on the same file but different bugs the system performs a lockout meaning that only that person can access the file, this would be the series example, on the other hand the system can create a shadow database where the other user or users can work, although only one user will have write access at a time. From this it is shown that the takes can be set up to be done in parallel the Examiner therefore, asserts that limitations of the claims as currently written have been met.

***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **PAUL R. FISHER** whose telephone number is (571)270-5097. The examiner can normally be reached on **Mon/Fri [7:30am/5pm]** with first Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on (571)272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PRF

/Dennis Ruhl/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3689